

10/691,999

MS306808.01/MSFTP535US

REMARKS

Claims 1-33 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. Claims 13 and 14 have been amended herein to address the Examiner's recent objection. It is noted that these amendments do not necessitate a new search or any undue effort by the Examiner as they do not present new claimed subject matter.

Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments and amendments herein.

I. Objection of Claims 13 and 14

Claims 13 and 14 are objected to because of minor informalities. In view of the amendments to the subject claims, this objection is believed to be moot and should be withdrawn.

II. Rejection of Claims 1-4, 6, 7, 10, 11, 21, 22, 25-27 and 29-32 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claims 1-4, 6, 7, 10, 11, 21, 22, 25-27 and 29-32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Belani *et al.* (US 6,772,350). Applicants' representative respectfully requests withdrawal of this rejection for at least the following reasons. Belani *et al.* does not disclose or suggest each and every element of applicants' invention recited in the subject claims.

A single prior art reference anticipates a patent claim only if it *expressly or inherently describes each and every limitation set forth in the patent claim.* *Trintec Industries, Inc. v. Top-U.S.A. Corp.*, 295 F.3d 1292, 63 USPQ2d 1597 (Fed. Cir. 2002); *See Verdegaaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). *The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the... claim.* *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

The claimed invention relates to employing a security model in accordance with hierarchically arranged data items. Specifically, independent claim 1 recites a data store that includes at least one hierarchical data structure and a security component that applies at least one

10/691,999

MS306808.01/MSFTP535US

security policy to each of the plurality of data items *within a defined region in the data store*. Belani *et al.* is silent regarding such novel features of the subject claims.

Belani *et al.* relates an access controller that manages accessibility to various resources in a multi-domain server and/or network. Belani *et al.* can apply an access list for a plurality of resources, a hierarchy associated with the resources, and/or user hierarchy information in order to provide secure access to the plurality of resources in there entirety. (See col. 6, lines 51-55). By employing these methods to provide security access to the plurality of resources, the cited reference allows for obtaining permissions for access to specific resources in various ways. However, once permissions are obtained for the resources, Belani *et al.* fails to provide a manner in which to define a specified region of the resource in which to apply the access rights allowed by the permission.

On page 4 of the Final Office Action with respect to independent claim 1, it is contended that the claimed limitations of applying at least one security policy to each of the plurality of data items *within a defined region in the data store* is an inherent feature of the data store. However, according to the claimed invention, the data store includes at least one hierarchical structure, and defining a region of a hierarchical structure containing data store for the purpose of applying a security policy is not an inherent feature of Belani *et al.* To the contrary, the cited reference simply allows for obtaining access right permissions for resources, and applying it to a hierarchy of resources without considering any type of a defined region. Therefore, the cited reference is silent regarding applying at least one security policy to each of the plurality of data items within a defined region in the data store.

Furthermore, independent claims 22 and 29 recite similar limitations, namely defining at least one security region for a data store including at least one hierarchical data structure *and applying the security policy to the security region associated with the data store including the at least one hierarchical data structure*. The Examiner incorrectly asserts that Belani *et al.* teaches these claimed aspects by referring to a portion of the reference that shows the use of a directed acyclic graph (DAG) to represent resource hierarchy information. (See col. 8, lines 15-26 and col. 9, lines 25-35 and 52-59). Instead of applying a specific security policy to a particularly defined security region, the reference applies the access controller module (ACLR) to an entire hierarchy of resources that are not segmented into security regions. Thus, the

10/691,999

MS306808.01/MSFTP535US

reference does not disclose applying the security policy to the security region associated with the data store including the at least one hierarchical data structure, as recited in claim 22.

Moreover, with respect to independent claim 30, it is asserted in the Final Office Action that Belani *et al.* discloses *a first data field related to a security region associated with a data store containing at least one hierarchical data structure*, as claimed. At the indicated portion of the cited document, Belani *et al.* simply discloses that ACLR information is associated with each resource and identifies which users are allowed to access these resources. Nowhere is there a suggestion of a data field that stores information related to identifying a specific security region of the data store. Rather, as previously discussed, Belani *et al.* is limited to applying access right information to a hierarchy or resources without taking into account a specified security region within this hierarchy when providing access right information. Consequently, the cited reference is silent regarding all the limitations of independent claim 30.

In view of at least the foregoing comments, it is readily apparent that Belani *et al.* does not teach the identical invention in as much detail as is contained in the subject claims. Accordingly, this rejection with respect to independent claims 1, 22, 29, and 30 (and the claims that depend therefrom) should be withdrawn.

III. Rejection of Claims 5, 12-17, 23, 24 and 28 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 5, 12-17, 23, 24 and 28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Belani, *et al.* in view of Dennis, *et al.* (US 6,466,932). Applicants' representative respectfully requests withdrawal of this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Claims 5, 12-17, 23, 24 and 28 depend from independent claims 1 and 22, and as stated *supra*, Belani *et al.* does not teach, disclose or suggest applicants' invention as recited in such independent claims; and Dennis *et al.* does not cure the aforementioned deficiencies of the primary reference. Accordingly, this rejection should be withdrawn.

IV. Rejection of Claim 8 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claim 8 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Belani, *et al.* in view of applicants' alleged admittance of prior art. Applicants' representative respectfully requests the rejection be withdrawn for the following reasons.

10/691,999

MS306808.01/MSFTP535US

The subject claim depends from independent claim 1, and as previously discussed, Belani *et al.* does not teach or suggest all limitations of claim 1. The alleged admitted prior does not compensate for the aforementioned deficiencies of Belani *et al.* Therefore, applicants' representative respectfully requests this rejection be withdrawn.

V. Rejection of Claims 9 and 20 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 9 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Belani, *et al.* in view of applicants' alleged admittance of prior art and further in view of Dennis, *et al.*

Claims 9 and 20 depend from independent claim 1. As stated *supra*, Belani *et al.* does not teach, disclose or suggest applicants' invention as recited in this independent claim; and Dennis *et al.* does not cure the aforementioned deficiencies of the primary references. Applicants' representative respectfully requests withdrawal of this rejection.

VI. Rejection of Claims 18, 19 and 33 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 18, 19 and 33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Belani *et al.* in view of Sandler *et al.* (US 2003/0217033). Applicants' representative respectfully requests the rejection be withdrawn for the following reasons.

As stated *supra*, Belani *et al.* does not teach, disclose or suggest applicants' invention as recited in independent claims 1 and 30 (of which claims 18, 19, and 30 depend there from); and Sandler *et al.* does not cure the aforementioned deficiencies of the primary references. This rejection should be withdrawn.

10/691,999MS306808.01/MSFTP535US**CONCLUSION**

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments and amendments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063 [MSFTP535US].

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

AMIN & TUROCY, LLP



David W. Grillo
Reg. No. 52,970

AMIN & TUROCY, LLP
24TH Floor, National City Center
1900 E. 9TH Street
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
Telephone (216) 696-8730
Facsimile (216) 696-8731